AND HOW NOT TO CURE IT

In huge type on the cover of US News and World Report for April 22, 1955, are these words: DEMOCRACY'S SICKNESS — And a Way to Cure It, By Walter Lippmann.

The article thus entitled takes over 20 full pages of the magazine, being a condensation or series of excerpts from a forthcoming book, "The Public Philosophy". And that is what it deals with: the need of our divided and what Lippmann calls our mass-pressured democracy for a public philosophy or common creed and, he adds, for a political development in the direction of authority and stability to the end that our rulers may have more power to rule and the masses, the voters, may have less power to influence their rulers.

If the excerpts in the magazine fairly represent his meaning, this book, though perhaps not so intended, can be and doubtless will be used as a philosophical or moral justification for those who wish to establish an authoritative regime in the USA.

Not that the book, as represented here, is a blueprint for American fascism. It is not. But there are passages in it, some, when taken out of their context, and others, not taken out of context, which may inwardly sustain those elements now sick (not with but) of democracy and feverish with the desire to strangle it.

And running through the whole argument is what may be called a formal emphasis reflecting a mind not at intimate grips with its subject matter. No doubt Lippmann would smilingly plead not guilty to formalism. After all, he is a working journalist as well as a moral philosopher. Moreover, he has, ever since he was a pupil of Graham Wallis, proclaimed himself a liberal. Yet, with great disappointment, we have been finding his newspaper columns showing evidence of a drying up of the sap of liberalism. And now, by a strange compulsion it would seem, he has been driven to believe that the enfeeblement of the capacity to govern and what he calls the "precipitate and catastrophic decline of Western society" (p. 62) are due to mass domination of government. "Where mass opinion dominates the government, there is a morbid derangement of the true functions of power." (p.62.)

Mass opinion means the opinion of the voters, the "sovereign people." "No more than the kings before them should the people be hedged with divinity." (p.62.)

"The people have acquired power which they are incapable of exercising and the governments they elect have lost powers which they must recover if they are to govern." (p.62.)

Lippmann harks back longingly to the Victorian era when "elected parliaments were little consulted in the deliberations which led up to war, or on the high strategy of the war...." (p.62.)

The general idea is that liberal democracy (and Lippmann calls himself a liberal democrat) can't be made to work except by men who share the philosophy on which it was founded. The foundation of that philosophy is the natural law, meaning the law which is above ruler and ruled. And its offspring are the traditions of civility, a phrase from the poet Coventry Patmore meaning for Lippmann "the liberties Western man had won for himself after centuries of struggle and which were now threatened by the rising tide of barbarity." (p.59)

This barbarity Lippmann pretty well defines as the mounting power of mass opinion. In other words the voters have too much to say about running the country. He says:

"The unhappy truth is that the prevailing public opinion has been destructively wrong at the critical junctures. The people have imposed a veto upon the judgments of informed and responsible officials. They

have compelled the government, which usually knew what would have been wiser, or was necessary, or was more expedient, to be too late with too little, or too long with too much, too pacifist in peace and too bellicose in war, too neutralist or appeasing in negotiation or too intransigent. Mass opinion has acquired mounting power in this century. It has shown itself to be a dangerous master of decisions when the stakes are life and death." (p.64.)

Yet even as this is written, the Christian Science Monitor commentator from the United Nations, speaking over the CBC network, tells us how the peace faction in the Administration has been strengthened by the avalanche of mass pressure against the war which Senator Knowland and others are advocating in the Formosa straits.

We join Lippmann in lamenting the enfeeblement of the traditions of civility and the rule of law above all persons. But is he not confused as to the source of this enfeeblement? Is this source not another "public" philosophy, hatched out of Manchester, the doctrine of laisser-faire or dog-eat-dog capitalism? Has not this rationalization of the enthronement of private profit been at least a very large part of the cause of the enfeeblement? This plus the fact that capitalism itself is just after moving (to a large degree) out of the phase of competition and into that of monopoly and cartel, so that with its feet on the plains of monopoly and its mind still in the jungle of competition it is mightily confused. Cartel Capitalism calling itself Free Enterprise entertains a vacuum within itself. It lacks unity of will and purpose. This, not mass pressure, is what stymies it. Lippmann draws the red herring of mass pressure across his trail while he bends his efforts to provide a philosophy to fill this vacuum.

For dog has eaten dog until many dogs have been concentrated into giant mastiffs like Standard Oil, DuPont, US Steel. These giants fear no competition. They either crush it, buy it, or displace it with an "arrangement" or cartel. As for the masses, the "mob", the giants have their foundations and their public relations counsels to placate these. Lippmann, in his own person one of their greatest advisers, thinks they need a dose of philosophy, a "public" philosophy of self-restraint. To make it taste better he advocates limits on dissent, or, what in its final result amounts to an inquisition against free controversy.

Remember that in the early days of laissez-faire and down through Victorian days there were no limits on freedom of controversy. In advocating such limits today is not Lippmann catering to the taste of the cartels?

There are tiny fringes of life today where debate is untrammeled. If Walter Lippmann could join us in the taxi office where we work, if he could listen to the talk of the "boys", talk which fairly well reflects the climate of opinion manufactured in the newspapers (owned by rich businessmen) and on the radio (controlled in Canada by a businessman's government) he might learn much about this enfeeblement and about its source.

The dark confusion, the cynicism, the lost bearings, are all there. But once in a while through the confusion bursts a ray of common-sense. Occasionally some one asks a piercing question (for this is one place where debate is uninhibited), a question that would shock radio audiences for it cuts sharply and rudely across all the propaganda of press and radio. If Lippmann is honest in his desire for social salvation he would revise his opinion as to the place whence our salvation may come.

Taxi drivers are people, in this town not different from those in most towns on this continent. They live in one of the last frontiers of real free enterprise. They pay a lot of tribute, heavy taxes, heavy rents, heavy interest to the finance companies. With a very few exceptions they are honest and generous, with their own code of honour to which they adhere strictly. They are people, common people. Here is what the great American poet Walt Whitman said about the common people:

"The genius of the United States is not best or most in its executives or legislators, nor in its ambassadors or authors or colleges or churches or parlors, nor even in its newspapers or inventors — but always most in its common people."

Walt Whitman lived with the common people, nursed them in the hospitals and on the battle-fields of the Civil War, companioned with them through all the open roads of America. He knew them at first hand, whereas Walter Lippmann's knowledge appears to have come from reading books, and perhaps not always the right books. He divides man's nature into two radically opposed natures. His first or fundamental nature is barbaric. It must be mastered by a second superimposed nature fed by the traditions of civility. When those traditions loosen their hold, men fall back to their first (barbaric) natures. For "people are only precariously civilized, and within us there is the propensity, persistent as the force of gravity" to revert to our first natures.

In this pessimistic (and in our opinion thoroughly false) view of human nature we find Lippmann reflecting the influence of the powerful neo-orthodox school of theology. These pessimists should take a look at the texts: "My yoke is easy and my burden is light," and "I came that ye might have life and have it more abundantly." Jesus found the raw human nature of little children sweet ("of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.") To him it was natural for men to inherit the Kingdom of God. He found radical evil, yes, but where? Where were the devils he could not cast out? In the teachers, the trustees of the ancient traditions of civility. The rust of pride had closed the conduits through which the water of truth no longer came through to the people. That, in fact, was why God had to break a new way through to the people and chose one of the people, an ordinary laboring man to do the job. They, the official teachers, would not enter his more natural way of living and they would not permit others to enter!

Of course this is the old argument about total depravity. Yet it does bear upon practical matters of the moment. For if our fundamental natures are evil, then we need masters who will police us and superimpose an artificial second "nature" upon us. Where these masters will come from is the question. The neo-orthodox theologians say they will derive their authority from revelation, the Bible. But many tunes have been played on the Bible, among them the Devil's Dream. And the neo-orthodox are, like the rest of us, prone to do evil as the sparks to fly upward. Their basic human nature is evil too, selfish, ambitious, security-conscious, lustful, according to their own witness. The motes they see in raw human nature are but the reflections of the beams in their own eyes.

But their "philosophy" can be used as a fine pretext for any oligarchy or tyrant who wants to get control of the people. And so it is we fear that Lippmann's book may be used. For it both reflects and rationalizes a swing in the West towards authority and away from popular democracy.

In a part of his book to which we shall refer later, Lippmann, pleading for uninhibited public debate, says:

"But despite the effort of the companies (he is speaking of broadcasting companies) to let opposing views be heard equally, and to organize programs on which there are opposing speakers, the technical conditions of broadcasting do not favor genuine and productive debate" (p.151.) Rather than technical conditions should he not have said commercial conditions? He almost admits this when he says, "In the prevailing popular culture all philosophies are the instruments of some man's purpose, all truths are self-centered and self-regarding, and all principles are the rationalizations of some special interest." (p.149.) But none of these "philosophies", "truths" or "principles" arises from the masses. As he says, they serve to rationalize (put a reasonable face upon) "some special interest." What the old-time soap-boxers called "the interests." They all originate in men who, like Lippmann himself perhaps, may wish to manipulate the masses and

make them more pliable to certain of these "interests" whom Lippmann may have chosen for his élite, kindly rich men with a sense of trusteeship, not the robber barons who said the public be damned.

As we turn back the pages of history to those times when mass opinion, if it existed at all, was in no position to interfere with the high policy of the ruling class, how many chapters do we find illumined by wise decisions? We fear that whatever governing caste Lippmann may have in mind will do no better. At this moment the US has a Secretary of State for whom his job is a calling from on High. He makes mistakes with the regularity of a cuckoo announcing the hours. He is really Lippmann's ideal of professional statesman who goes his way undisturbed by popular clamor. One of his recent "bobbles" as so reported by Lippmann himself in his newspaper column concerned a difference which arose between the US and Nationalist China. As Lippmann puts it, "there developed a flat contradiction between the position taken by the State Department and that taken by Secretary Dulles a few days later." The Department had said the US would consult Chiang in any cease-fire negotiations and then Dulles comes out and declares that the US might dispense with consulting Chiang "as far as concerns a cease fire which involved the possible interests of the United States."

This was more than just a bobble. Here is an ally of the US being told in so many words that it is expendable. Now what mass opinion is forcing the Secretary of State to commit such blunders? We submit that what Lippmann attributes to mass pressure should be attributed to the essential confusion of the capitalist mind, a confusion which naturally issues from the inner conflict within capitalism. For capitalism wants to live and it wants to die. US capitalism knows Chiang is doomed. It should in its own interest keep Chiang from knowing that it knows he is doomed. But when the chips are down (and they are pretty well down in Formosa) the ugly truth is blurted out. If it suits us we will have a cease fire. You think you are going to invade the mainland. In fact, you know you are. We have buttressed you and fed you and armed you in that knowledge. But the timing must be ours. We hold the starting gun. And it is just possible that we may not fire it at all. That depends on many things. But not on you. You are nothing but a convenience to us in our last-ditch fight to make the world safe for profit.

That is what Dulles blurted out in the tradition of civility which he, as political protagonist of organized Christianity, reveres just as much as Lippmann does, and can talk about just as persuasively.

Those who serve the China lobby should know that their real masters are not Chiang and his gang but the oil and steel and electric and armament cartels. Chiang's people may have put real dollars into the pockets of American legislators but these are peanuts compared with the wealth of the cartels, which are actually no less than super nations. Books are written about cartels, books which never seem to obtain mass circulation. Many people don't even know they exist. They are never mentioned on the radio or in the press and they never talk about themselves. Few have any idea of their vast power.

Lippmann's concern is not with the inordinate power of the cartels but with what he thinks is the inordinate power of the masses who have lost their sense of right and wrong, true and false. It is their freedom which should be curtailed. He thinks freedom of thought was all right up to the end of the 18th century because it was always supported by the natural law. But, he says, "the school of natural lawhas not been able to cope with the pluralism of the later modern age —with the pluralism which has resulted from the industrial revolution and from the enfranchisement and the emancipation of the masses of the people." (p.148. Our emphases.)

By stressing pluralism Lippmann side-steps the dualism of the class war. As to the enfranchisement and emancipation, these were

yielded to the masses with one hand and taken away with the other.

Always up to now the people have been cheated of the full fruits of their revolutions. As long as the machine owning class remained in the driver's seat there could be no fundamental enfranchisement or emancipation of the workers, and as for philosophy or religion the owning class saw to it that the gospel preached to the people was one disembowelled of its communist guts.

Lippmann blames everything on the fact that "the great frame of reference to the rational order was missing." But so long as men are human they can never completely lose their rationality. And so long as they remain human the essence of the true public philosophy will be in them and they will nurture the democratic faith. When Lippmann says, "the citadel is vacant because the public philosophy is gone," he is talking of those teachers and writers who reflect the mores of greed. He says, "the modern trouble is in a low capacity to believe in precepts which restrict and restrain private interests and desires." What then of the "blood, sweat and tears" promised the people by Churchill? Did they not passionately accept the restrictions and restraints on their private interests and desires when it seemed to them reasonable and necessary to do so?

It was out of raw human nature that the Bible itself came. And its message is not only that a man dared to be God, but that God turned out to be a man. The gulf between Creator and creature was bridged. Conceive for the moment that the Bible didn't exist. Yet its truth is written in the hearts of men and would in time break forth. People, it is true, get into ruts, and sometimes for centuries seem not to move forward. But all that time seeds, hidden in the crevices of the walls of their stagnation, are germinating and growing until finally the growth breaks down the walls and there is released in men a power to build new and better dwelling places for their spirits.

Concerning the theory of property Lippmann says, "the laws of property may and should be judged, reviewed and, when necessary, amended, so as to define the specific system of rights and duties that will promote the ends of society." (p.149.) Thus Lippmann denies the doctrine of property which makes it a pretension to "sole and despotic dominion." "When Blackstone, though his conscience was troubled, accepted the sole and despotic dominion, he broke with the public philosophy and the traditions of civility. After his break the recognized theorists developed regressively the conception of private property as an absolute right." Was this due to the pressure of the masses? Hardly. This was a war against the masses by the owners of land and machinery. Against the masses and against their material inheritance, the earth itself. It culminates today in the unspeakable monstrosity of the atomic and bacterial annihilation of peoples and their resources.

Lippmann himself realizes some of the intolerable evils arising from absolute private property. "Absolute owners did grave damage to their neighbors and to their descendents: they ruined the fertility of the land, they exploited destructively the minerals under the surface, they burned and cut forests, they destroyed the wild life, they polluted streams, they cornered supplies and formed monopolies, they held land and resources out of use, they exploited the feeble bargaining power of wage earners.

"For such abuses of absolute property the political scientists and the law makers had no remedy. They had lost the tradition that property is the creation of the law for social purposes. They had no principles by which the law could deal with the abuses of property." (p.149.)

We submit that Lippmann puts the cart before the horse. The theory followed the practice, rationalized it, hallowed it, raised it

to the position of a religious dogma. But the practice and the practitionaers were there first to egg on and reward the theorists.

And one thing Lippmann omits from his brave list ot the crimes of the exploiters: the debauching of the teachers, the publicists and the columnists by the insidious power of private wealth, the buying of chairs in universities, the buying of departments of political science, the coercing of whole educational systems, the corruption of the clergy, the abuse of sports, entertainment, literature, in the attempt to degrade the people and reduce them to the dead level of their lowest common denominator.

Lippmann's recitation of the abuses of private property could be found in any prospectus for the corporative state. It is the come-on of fascism, misleading the unwary victim into thinking he is being sold a revolution, whereas he is being swindled into a counter-revolution. Many fine people, for instance one of our best commentators, Lisa Sergio, were fooled by the early pronouncements of fascism. Let Americans be on their guard.

The idea of property as trusteeship is the modern expression of noblesse oblige. Why does Lippmann want to restore the idea of owing to that of owning? Does he sense the approach of the last days for the great private concentrations of wealth? And does he want to prolong these last days by an attempt to recall the past? It would appear so. Otherwise why not set up the principle that private property is for private ends and may not be used to exploit others for profit? This is the very simple principle which rules in socialist countries. It is entirely in harmony with, in fact it is the fulfillment of the natural law and the traditions of civility. But Lippmann sets up no such principle. He talks of private property serving or promoting "the grand ends of civil society." Such a phrase can mean most anything. There is no doubt whatever that many of the owners of Italian industry felt they were making great sacrifices for the common good, conforming to the requirements of the medieval concept of property obligations and promoting the grand ends of civil society when they joined Mussolini in forming the fascist corporations.

To return to the question of freedom of controversy, which in our view is the very breath of democracy, Lippmann unites the right to speak with the willingness to debate. Yet, in this section of his argument he takes for granted as facts certain myths which have been established precisely by means of having them repeated as facts over the radio, in the press and in all other media of mass commnucation. One of the most important and one of the most deadly is the communazi myth, the equating of communist revolution with nazi counter-revolution. This myth damns the communist and, what is perhaps worse, conceals the nazi. Lippmann classes communism with nazism as a counter-revolutionary movement. The fascist and communist parties, he says, use democratic processes in order to achieve power and then destroy them. But whereas fascism did arise in politically democratic countries, Finland, Germany, Austria, it can hardly be said that communism developed in Russia or in China by first using and then trampling on democratic rights. In these two classic examples democracy had never had a chance to be born, let alone develop a tradition. Therefore communism as we know it was and remains revolutionary, whereas fascism, nazism, and the other authoritarian regimes, have all been supported by the beneficiaries of the status quo, blessed by organized wealth, religion and the professional military.

In accepting this myth of nazi-communist counter-revolution Lippmann proves himself a victim of the now well-established closure of popular debate on this matter. Every week or so someone who tries even to keep up the appearance of debate is removed from the air-waves. Lippmann thinks there is "efficient" "confrontation in debate" in the standard newspaper press taken as a whole." (p.151.) Could he be

influenced by the fact of the wide circulation of his column? Let him write candidly of the sacred cows of journalism, let him write against, instead of for, the cold war! Then he would quickly see how the debate is handled in the newspapers.

It is some years since Abraham Pomerantz wrote his powerful "Dissent Becomes Disloyalty" and until this day the tide of debate has not yet returned to bless the barren reaches of our truly sick democracy. And what do we see? Along comes the one-time liberal Walter Lippmann to tell us that limits must be put upon dissent.

"The limits of dissent are not too difficult to fix....The borderline between sedition and radical reform is between the denial and the acceptance of the sovereign principle of the public philosophy: that we live in a rational order in which by sincere inquiry and rational debate we can distinguish the true and the false, the right and the wrong. The counterrevolutionists, who suppress freedom in order to propagate the official doctrine, reject the procedure by which in the free society official policy is determined."

But will not those who disbelieve in this procedure be the most eloquent defenders of this procedure? Huey Long said it. Fascism will come wrapped in the flag of democracy. Will the oil cartel come right out and say here am I, the oil cartel, I am so strong, so interwoven into the life of this country that my wish and the wish of the country must be one? Hardly. It will smile, however, or grin, or whatever it is corporations do when they are well served, if some brilliant writer like Lippmann comes along with a well-thought-out philosophy which will accomplish the same result. Under the terms of freedom, limited, under the banner of liberty, with a few chains here and there, I shall continue to control opinion and stifle debate. In the name of socially oriented private property I shall hold on to my vast power for a while yet. Under the public philosophy we shall hang on to our private property and, we shall never say it but we shall think it, the public be damned!

There are many interesting things in this book of Lippmann's. We have touched on but a few. His fundamental error in our opinion, conceding his honesty, is religious. "For the radical error of the modern democratic gospel is that it promises, not the good life of this world, but the perfect life of heaven. The root of the error is the confusion of the two realms —that of this world where the human condition is to be born, to live, to work, to struggle and to die, and that of the transcendent world in which men's souls can be regenerate and at peace. The confusion of these two realms is an ultimate disorder. It inhibits the good life in this world. It falsifies the life of the spirit." (p.153.)

Here Lippmann's Niebuhr is showing. Here is the rank heresy of the neo-orthodox. Jesus ("Be ye perfect!") and the greatest saints are witnesses against such teaching, for it was their express purpose and practice to break down this division between two realms, to do God's will on earth, to find in honest work communion with Reality. Laborare est orare, said the monks. "The drift of pinions, would we hearken," said Francis Thompson, "beats at our own clay-shuttered doors." Right here and now, not only in the lives of the saints, but in the honest work of ordinary men and women, our souls can be regenerate and at peace. Praise God!

The whole idea that "the public philosophy cannot be popular," as Lippmann repeats, is repugnant to those of us who have known the patience of poor workers who hold up their heads in all kinds of adversity, who help one another in trouble, and who really sweat the blood and tears the orators talk about. There is a good reason why Lippmann's conception of the public philosophy cannot be popular. It is because it is not truly public. It is private.

THE YALTA PAPERS

By Louise Harding

April 14, the San Mateo Times reported a speech made by Senator Magnuson before the San Mateo Democratic leaders. He said that Republican Senator Arthur Vandenburg had told him personally that "the decisions reached at Yalta were those that would have been reached by reasonable men at that time and under those circumstances."

April 1, 1955, the Hearst press noted that Major General Courtney Whitney (retired), former chief political adviser to MacArthur, had told the Washington Post and Times-Herald that

> "There can be no doubt in any reasonable mind, after reading such reports (messages between MacArthur and the Joint chiefs) that the general felt most strongly that Japan was approaching collapse from the pressure of Allied arms long prior to the Yalta conference with the tragic decisions."

This is cited here as further proof that the throwing of the Bombs on the Japanese cities was no military necessity. Those who advocated the savage measure simply wanted to be sure that Japan surrendered before Russia could get into the war by the date agreed upon at Yalta and thereby gain the influence in the East to which she was entitled by her general services in the war.

March 10, 1955, the San Francisco News (Roy Howard) said editorially that "General Groves had reported (top secret, of course) that the bomb would be ready by Aug. 1st, 1945, and it was so promising that a full-scale test would not be necessary."

This does away with the argument that there would not have been time for a demonstration on some barren island, as 64 of the atomic scientists had demanded.

Louis Morton, chief of the Pacific section of the Army's Office of Military History, had an article in the "Reporter" (April 7, 1955) quoting the Joint Chiefs of Staff as saying, shortly before Yalta, "We desire Russian entry at the earliest possible date consistent with her ability to engage in offensive operations....." General MacArthur "was thoroughly in favor of the plan and stated emphatically at the time of Yalta to more than one visitor that American forces should not invade Japan until three months after the Red Army had attacked in Manchuria," writes Morton. Russia had agreed to enter the war by Aug. 8th. The first Bomb was dropped Aug. 6! This explains why MacArthur had fixed on Nov 1 for starting the land invasion of Japan. Morton further writes:

"There is no doubt that Japan was defeated in the military sense before the atom bomb was dropped or Russia entered the war. But which of these events forced the Japanese to surrender? Japanese records will not support the conclusion that the atom bomb alone accomplished that result. Russia's declaration of war had at least as great an effect as Hiroshima."

By which we can see how insolent has been the attitude of the USA, and how unjustified that Monopoly Capitalism must dominate Asia.

The assistant secretary of Dulles, Carl McCardle, who is said to take no step in the State Department without the knowledge and consent of his chief, and who would certainly not act independently in so important a matter as the Yalta Papers, handed them to Reston of the New York Times on March 15. But, writes Drew Pearson,

"on Wednesday , March 16, when Senators Knowland of California and Bridges of New Hampshire asked Dulles about the leak, Dulles denied any knowledge of it. In fact, Bridges quoted Dulles as saying he was 'aghast' to hear of it."

A brazen statement indeed; and it was ridiculous of Knowland and

Bridges to pretend they had to ask Dulles —they were all in favor of publication.

According to Pearson, Eden had specifically cabled Dulles asking that the papers not be published. They were handed over on Tuesday, March 15, although, according to Ray Tucker (McClure Syndicate) "on Monday Secretary Dulles informed Prime Minister Churchill that the documents would not be made public, in deference to his objections."

On April 19, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee summoned Dulles to explain. Dulles said McCardle was within his rights in giving out the papers. Senator Morse said he considered Dulles to have been "in collusion" with McCardle and Reston "in leaking the documents." The UP report says,

> Dulles' prepared testimony showed that McCardle delivered the papers to Reston on Tuesday night, March 15, and that British agreement to permit publication was not received until the following morning..... Several committee members said Dulles insisted he did not know McCardle was going to give Reston an advance copy of the papers.

The AP report (April 20) says

> "..... Dulles said he had concluded by the time the one copy was given out that the British government had withdrawn its objections to publication and that publication would not hurt United States relations with Allies."

"Oh, what a tangled web we weave, when first we practice to deceive." ....but Dulles has had plenty of practice.

The New York Times (March 23, page 5) said that in the House of Commons, realization that the release of the papers might prevent a meeting with the Soviet Union caused its (the publication's) announcement to be greeted with "...cries of astonishment and dismay..." (Quoted from the Flashlight, published by the Palo Alto Peace Club, Palo Alto, California.)

All this seemed to be clarified by Ray Tucker in his column, "Behind the News." Writing in praise of Eisenhower Tucker says,

"He has shown that he can act aggressively and promptly, when necessity demands. .....The decision to publish the Yalta papers, for instance, was praised and blamed, and attributed to 'petty politics'. They were released in order to delay or block Churchill-Pinay demands for an immediate but, so Ike felt, a premature conference with the Russians on a top-level basis.

"Knowing privately that Churchill would soon step out, and that his successor, Sir Anthony Eden, also opposed the proposed conversations, Ike took this method of reminding Churchill and Pinay that the Reds' pledges could not be trusted. It worked as he and Secretary Dulles hoped."

Since the truth is that the Allies began to sabotage the Yalta agreement to demilitarize and decartelize Germany, even before the war ended, as can be abundantly proved (see "All Honorable Men" by James Stewart Martin), it is perfectly plain whose pledges could not be trusted. Everything that Roosevelt hoped for after the war was killed, Harry Truman a willing accomplice to the murder.

This writer often wonders, how could Roosevelt have expected otherwise? He well understood the forces of great, concentrated wealth, that tend to war. Nothing fundamental about them had been changed. Roosevelt depended on a few promises, made in extremity, from those whom he well knew to be utterly without mercy or honor.

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + +

LIBRARY
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
297 FOURTH AVENUE
NEW YORK 10, N. Y.

NEW CHRISTIAN

MAY 1955

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. Imre Kadar
Rev. J. Spencer, Jr.
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Leslie Roberts
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etienne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson

NEW CHRISTIAN is published monthly by New Christian Books, 95 Argyle Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No Agents.**

NEW CHRISTIAN

May, 1955 Edited by Kenneth Leslie

DEMOCRACY'S SICKNESS AND HOW NOT TO CURE IT

A Comment on Lippmann

By the Editor

THE YALTA PAPERS

By Louise Harding

Vol. XI, No. 7 30 cents